

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appln. No.: 10/078,372
Response/Amendment dated March 2, 2006
Response to Office Action dated December 28, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application. Claims 1-19 are rejected. Claims 1, 3, 8, 17, and 19 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced into the application. As explained in more detail below, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request such action.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. More specifically, the Office Action asserts that the criteria for defining an optimized display criteria was not adequately described in the specification. In amending claims 1, 8, 17 and 19 for other reasons, the limitation was removed. However, the Applicants submit that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was discovered to utilize the numerous methods for optimizing a display. In fact, in rejecting claims 2, 6 – 7, 9, 12 – 14, and 17 – 18 (each having the limitation, or ultimately depending from a claim having the limitation of...), the Office Action asserts:

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, at the time of the applicants' invention, to crop or resize images of a given animation, which when combined form a multimedia presentation. (Office Action dated December 28, 2005; pages 7 – 8; emphasis added). Indeed, many more methods of optimizing display resolution were known in the art at the time of the Applicants'

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appl. No.: 10/078,372
Response/Amendment dated March 2, 2006
Response to Office Action dated December 28, 2005

invention. In fact, in rejecting claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 15 – 16, and 19, the Office Action explicitly states that an object of an asserted patent, the '506 patent, is to:

provide a method and apparatus for reproducing sounds and/or images with a resolution that is optimized to the capabilities of the client computer that is decoding previously encoded sounds and/or images...[therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, at the time of the applicant's invention, to incorporate [the two asserted references] because through such incorporation it would allow for said animation to be displayed at a resolution optimized to the capabilities of said mobile station"].

(Office Action dated December 28, 2005; page 4; emphasis added). As explained below, there are many differences between the asserted references and the subject matter of claims 1 – 19, however, it is clear that one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been able to define criteria for improving resolution without undue experimentation.

Moreover, the specification provides additional methods of increasing the resolution. For example, the users of the wireless handheld communication device may perform pixel-wise editing of the images in the animation. (See, e.g., Specification, page 11, lines 16 – 23). Therefore, for at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection. Moreover, the Applicants retain the right to later include such limitations within the claims.

Claims 1, 8, 17, and 19 are objected to because of the following informalities: lack of antecedent basis for the limitation "the terminal". Through this Response and Amendment, the Applicants have removed the term "terminal". The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Page 10 of 15

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appln. No.: 10/078,372
Response/Amendment dated March 2, 2006
Response to Office Action dated December 28, 2005

The Applicants have also corrected minor typographical errors in claims 1, 3, 8, 17 and 19, such as removing extraneous usage of the term "of" and properly reciting Markush groups in the claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 15-16, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,870,683 to Wells et al., ("the '683 patent") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,953,506 to Kalra et al., ("the '506 patent"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection in view of the Remarks below.

As set forth below in the Statement Establishing Common Ownership, the invention of the present application and the subject matter of the '683 patent were owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to, the same person at the time the invention of the present application was made. In accordance with 35 U.S.C. §103(c), such common ownership disqualifies the '683 patent as prior art for obviousness purposes. See also, MPEP §§706.02(1)(1)-(2). Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Statement Establishing Common Ownership

The undersigned attorney of record hereby states that the invention of the present application and the subject matter of U.S. Pat. No. 5,870,683 to Wells et al., were, at the time the present invention was made, owned by or subject to an obligation of assignment to Nokia Mobile Phones Limited. Such common ownership is reflected in the assignment records of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

Appl. No.: 10/078,372
Response/Amendment dated March 2, 2006
Response to Office Action dated December 28, 2005

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Claims 2, 6-7, 9, 12-14, and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,870,683 to Wells et al., ("the '683 patent") and U.S. Pat. No. 5,953,506 to Kalra et al., ("the '506 patent") as applied to claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 15-16, and 19, in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,516,202 to Hawkins et al., ("the '202 patent"), and further in view of the GCF Construction Set Professional Manual, referred to herein as GCSPM, and the GCF Construction Set Professional Homepage, referred to herein as GCSPH. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection in view of the Remarks below.

As set forth above, the primary reference, the '683 patent, cannot be asserted as prior art in regards to the subject matter of the rejected claims. Moreover, neither the '506 patent, the '202 patent, GCSPM nor the GCSPH, individually or collectively, teach, disclose, or otherwise suggest the subject matter of the rejected claims. For example, Claim 2 recites:

A method according to claim 1, wherein the sequence of images is displayed repeatedly for a number of times, a user of the handheld communication device set said number of times the display of the sequence of images is to be repeated.

The Office Action admits that the '683 patent does not suggest the subject matter, however, insists that it "would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to utilize an organizer with a cellular component, as taught by [the '202 patent] as a means to attain said additional resources for modification, storage and display of animation". (Office Action dated December 28, 2005; page 6).

Nowhere in the '202 patent is the concept of allowing a user to set the number of times the display of the sequence of images is to be repeated even suggested. In fact, the '202 patent is merely directed to an "organizer designed for a cellular telephone expansion" (the '202 patent, Summary of the Invention, Col. 1, line 44). Having a cellular phone with "additional features"

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appln. No.: 10/078,372
Response/Amendment dated March 2, 2006
Response to Office Action dated December 28, 2005

as alleged by the Office Action does not disclose or suggest the subject matter of claim 2 or any of the rejected claims. The '202 patent is also devoid of any reference to the subject matter of claims 6-7, 9, 12-14, and 17-18. In fact, the rejections of claims 6, 7, and 9 do not even reference or mention the '202 patent.

Specifically regarding the GCSPM, it is directed to an "application for creating animated and transparent GIF files for [a] web page." (GCSPM, page 1). Nowhere does it reference a mobile phone or the limitations of independent claims 1, 8, and 17, from which the claims ultimately depend.

For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 3-4 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,870,683 to Wells et al., ("the '683 patent"), U.S. Pat. No. 5,953,506 to Kalra et al., ("the '506 patent"), U.S. Pat. No. 6,516,202 to Hawkins et al., ("the '202 patent"), GCSPM and GCSPH, as applied to claims 2, 6-7, 9, 12-14 and 17-18, in view of applicant's admitted prior art referred to herein as AADA. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Remarks below.

As set forth above, the primary reference, the '683 patent, cannot be asserted as prior art in regards to the subject matter of the rejected claims. Also, the '202 patent is merely directed to an "organizer designed for a cellular telephone expansion" (the '202 patent, Summary of the Invention, Col. 1, line 44) and the GCSPM is directed to an "application for creating animated and transparent GIF files for [a] web page." (GCSPM, page 1). In fact, the Office Action states that ALL the asserted references "fail to explicitly disclose that if said number of times the

Appln. No.: 10/078,372
Response/Amendment dated March 2, 2006
Response to Office Action dated December 28, 2005

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

display of the sequence of images is to be repeated exceeds said predetermined number, the handheld communication device only repeats the display sequence said predetermined number of times." (Office Action dated December 28, 2005, page 10) The Office Action, however, asserts the "loop block" of GCSPM, which has an iterations argument that defines the number of times said animation will loop meets this limitation. Again, nowhere in the GCSPM is there any reference to a cellular phone or any of the limitations of the independent claims from which the rejected claims depend. Even combining the references would not produce the subject matter of the rejected claims.

For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number set forth below.

Applicant believes there is no fee due in association with the filing of this response, however, should there be any fees due the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any such fees or credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0733.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appln. No.: 10/078,372

~~Response to Office Action dated March 2, 2006~~

Response to Office Action dated December 28, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: March 2, 2006

By:



Shawn P. Gorman
Reg. No. 56,197

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 South Wacker Drive
Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606
Tel: (312) 463-5000
Fax: (312) 463-5001